

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,943,408) in view of Susai (US 6,411,986).

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,943,408) in view of Susai (US 6,411,986) and Smith (US 6,501,950).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 1-3 and 6-7

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,943,408) in view of Susai (US 6,411,986).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai, because Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

For example, Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest: "means for selecting a subset of the service nodes of the network through execution of a node reduction algorithm in response to a request for service by a subscriber of the wireless subscribers, said subset of the service nodes being limited to only those service nodes of the network which serve the subscriber's geographical area or logical telephone company area for services which the subscriber has subscribed to".

In addition, Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest: "means for selecting at least one service node of the subset of the service nodes to process said message signals by performing arbitration and prioritization among the nodes of the subset of service nodes in order to provide service responsive to the subscriber's request for service".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-3 and 6-7 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 2-3 and 6-7 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 8-9

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,943,408) in view of Susai (US 6,411,986).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 8 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai, because Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 8.

For example, Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest: "selecting a subset of the service nodes of the network through execution of a node reduction algorithm in response to a request for service by a subscriber of the wireless subscribers, said subset of the service nodes being limited to only those service nodes of the network which serve the subscriber's geographical area or logical telephone company area for services which the subscriber has subscribed to".

In addition, Chen in view of Susai does not teach or suggest: "performing arbitration and prioritization among nodes of the subset of services available from service nodes in order to provide service responsive to the subscriber's request for service, said creating the message signals not being performed by a service node of the network".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 8 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai, and that claim 8 is in condition for allowance. Since claim 9 depends from claim 8, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 9 is likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claim 4

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,943,408) in view of Susai (US 6,411,986) and Smith (US 6,501,950).

The Examiner argues: "Smith teaches, in a SS7 environment, the node selector routing based upon the location of the wireless subscriber originating the request and the signaling network including a means for validating the wireless subscriber (IS-41, col. 3 lines 43-52).".

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 8 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai and Smith, because Chen in view of Susai and Smith does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

For example, Chen in view of Susai and Smith does not teach or suggest: "node selector means for routing message signals to service nodes based on ... the location of the wireless subscriber originating the requesting call". Applicants respectfully contend that col. 3, lines 43-52 of Smith teach routing message signal between nodes of different service provider systems (i.e., a home system and a foreign system) irrespective of the location of the wireless subscriber originating the requesting call. Although the subscriber may be identified with the home system, there is no disclosure in Smith that the home system and the foreign system do not both serve the location of the wireless subscriber.

Also, Chen in view of Susai and Smith does not teach or suggest: "means for validating the wireless subscriber". Applicants respectfully contend that col. 3, lines 43-52 of Smith does not teach or suggest means for validating the wireless subscriber. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to cite specific language in col. 3, lines 43-52 of Smith that allegedly teaches or suggests "means for validating the wireless subscriber".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 4 is not unpatentable over Chen in view of Susai and Smith, and that claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 01/09/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/401,937

15